

R E P L Y

TO THE

“ADDITIONAL STRICTURES,”

CONTAINED

In the *First Number*

OF

THE QUARTERLY MEDICAL REVIEW,

ON THE

PRINCIPLES

OF

DENTAL SURGERY,

EXHIBITING

A NEW METHOD

OF TREATING

The Diseases of the Teeth and Gums,

ESPECIALLY CALCULATED

TO

PROMOTE THEIR HEALTH

AND

Beauty, &c.

BY

LEONARD KOECKER,

Surgeon-Dentist,

DOCTOR IN MEDICINE AND SURGERY; MEMBER OF THE MEDICAL AND LINNÆAN
SOCIETIES, AND OF THE ACADEMY OF NATURAL SCIENCE OF PHILADELPHIA,
ETC. ETC. ETC.

“PROBITAS OPTIMUM EST CONSILIUM.”

London:

TO BE HAD, GRATIS, AT T. & G. UNDERWOOD'S, 32, FLEET ST.

AND AT THE AUTHOR'S RESIDENCE, No. 15, CONDUIT STREET, HANOVER SQUARE.

MDCCCXXVII.

R E P L Y

TO THE

“ADDITIONAL STRICTURES,”

&c. &c. &c.

Toward the end of last year, I published the “*Principles of Dental Surgery*,” a work which immediately attracted the attention of the profession, as was sufficiently evinced by the extensive notice it met with in the periodicals. Its reception, generally speaking, was highly flattering, and assuredly yielded me no small gratification; gratification, however, which, like all terrestrial blessings, was not without alloy—some portion of ungenerous and unhandsome treatment. All the criticisms of the reviewers, with a single exception, whether ill or well founded, I received, not only with calmness, but even with complacency; persuaded that they sprung from the best motives, and were intended for the advantage of society, for the promotion of accurate Dental knowledge, and for my especial good in any future edition of my volume. The exception to which I have just alluded, is contained in the first number of “*The Quarterly Medical Review*,”— (“being a New Series of the Quarterly Journal of Foreign Medicine and Surgery,”) which was published last January. In this periodical, the “*Principles of Dental Surgery*” are reviewed in very handsome terms, evidently by some contributor; and, the Editor himself, in a note, alludes to “the general merits of the volume.” But that gentleman has thought proper—and I by no means blame him for having so done—to admit a *tail-piece* to the regular review, under the head, “*Additional Strictures on Mr. Koecker’s Work* :”—strictures avowedly written by a professional Dentist, and, I believe, a practitioner in London. It is of the unfairness of these strictures that I complain, and to their refutation that I have chiefly devoted the following reply. A note was sent with a proposal to publish it in the next number of the *Quarterly Medical Review*, but, from the nature of the answer, there seemed great uncertainty whether it might be accepted. I therefore determined to give it to the public in the form of a pamphlet.

Beyond doubt, had a professional brother reviewed my work with calmness, candour, impartiality, and the pure design of seeking after truth; of advancing the interests of Dentistry; and of being really useful to society and to the author, his avocation would have rendered him better fitted to become the *examinator* of such a work, than any general practitioner, surgeon, or physician, otherwise of equal attainments; because he would be able to bring all his own anatomical, physiological, pathological, and practical knowledge of the teeth, their diseases, and the modes of cure, to bear upon the various subjects which he had selected for animadversion or illustration. The unknown critic, however, has proved himself one of the most unfit persons in the world for such a task; because his mind has evidently been perverted by the vilest passions—professional jealousy, bitter envy, and determined malice. He must have set forth with the design to find fault with every trifle, to deprive me almost of any merit, and to hurt my professional character; in a word, the grand aim of his *strictures* seems to have been, a resolution to condemn my work and myself to oblivion;—an infernal attempt, in which, thanks to the members of an enlightened profession, and to a literate and generous public, he has totally failed. Indeed, I have no hesitation in saying—and I shall soon prove the assertion—that this *reviewer's* "strictures" on my work, chiefly consist of a tissue of captious hyper-criticisms, gratuitous assertions, malicious misrepresentations, and glaring falsehoods: and the only reason I can assign for his conduct is, that he may have found himself too faithfully portrayed, in the remarks which I have deemed it a duty to advance respecting some of the Dentists of this metropolis. In executing that duty, my great object was merely to expose *the unworthy intruders, and their improper practices in that art*, to which I have devoted particular attention for many years; and by so doing to promote the best interests of society. But I solemnly disclaim the intention of expressing disrespect, or of giving offence, to any of my respectable brethren, by the attempt which I made to introduce, what I conceive to be, improvements in Dentistry. Indeed, the personal acquaintance which I made of a few of my brother Dentists, immediately after my arrival in London, was sufficient to convince me, that this country possesses many talented, scientific, and valuable professors of this art.

Should the general tenor of my language, or any particular expressions, convey an idea, contrary to the above sentiments, I hope that my *sins* will be reckoned neither

those of the head nor of the heart; but be attributed chiefly to my want of a nice knowledge of the English language—though I speak it easily—of English habits, and of the general tone of English feelings. The editor of the Lond. Med. and Phys. Journal, No. 332, p. 373, thus liberally expresses himself on this head:—

“The author of the work before us is a German, who practised for many years in Philadelphia; and in perusing his book, it is but fair to keep in mind that he is a foreigner, not perfectly acquainted with our language or our ways.”

That I doubted my powers in the English language was evident from the following citation:—

“As a foreigner, he has no pretensions to talent for authorship, knowing that he is far from being able to write the English language with correctness. His object, therefore, it will soon be evident, is not literary fame, but the advancement of his profession, in connexion with the best interests of humanity. In publishing this manual, he is, moreover, partly influenced by the desire of proving that he is not unworthy of the confidence with which he has been honoured. However unlucky he may occasionally be in his mode of expression, he hopes that he may, at least, be able to make himself thoroughly understood; and that if indeed there be any superiority in his modes of treatment, it will not fail to be discovered and acknowledged.” Preface to the Principles of Dental Surgery. p. VII.

In this work I have addressed myself both to the *professional* and to the *general* reader, and have scrupulously avoided all technical terms, as well “as every thing else that might have the appearance of scientific mystery.” That this work was not believed to be perfect is manifest from a single paragraph.

“Should this Essay be favourably received, and its imperfections meet with the kind indulgence of the public, he (the author) may be encouraged to resume his original plan,”—the composition of a complete System of Dental Surgery.

I am anxious, in the outset, to defend myself against another general criticism of our reviewer. In the *strictures* he accuses me not only of deriding the *living*, but of violating the tomb, and ignorantly and presumptuously abusing such men as Monro, Hunter, Fox, and Blake; names which must ever be held in reverence by the profession. That I did not deserve such unmeasured censure, will be but too apparent for the critic’s honesty, from a few quotations:

“The French particularly deserve our acknowledgments for their industry to increase the stock of Dental literature; yet they have not produced one original standard work on the Natural History of the Teeth, similar to those of HUNTER, FOX, and

BLAKE, which could furnish them with sufficiently just and solid principles for the innumerable speculations and theories which they have advanced."

From this general censure some of the French writers should have been exempted, had I not borne in mind, the little useful knowledge which they, in common with many others, have communicated respecting the pathology and the diseases of the teeth, and the modes of cure.

I have spoken of Fox and Blake as

"Men, who by their eminent character have given a dignity to the profession to which they directed their abilities."

Again I have thus expressed myself:

"It is a well known fact, that there are quacks in every profession, and in every country; but it cannot be denied that they most particularly abound in the United States of America and in England. While I say this, however, I also feel it the most pleasing duty to add, *that I believe the profession of the Dentist to be no where in the hands of more scientific and excellent men*, and more appreciated by the enlightened public than in these countries; a fact of itself sufficient to prove the importance of the profession, and at the same time, exceedingly creditable to the intelligence of both nations." See Principles of Dental Surgery, pp. 2—4.

Besides these, I might quote many other equally convincing proofs of my high estimation of the immortal authors, to whom allusion has been made, which are scattered throughout my volume. It is true, however, that I have sometimes differed in opinion from their authority, and also that I have not spared them fair criticism;—thereby testifying my high esteem for their works, which, had they not held a pre-eminent value among the profession, as well as in my own mind, would not have been remarked upon at all in my volume.

The Dentist-Critic has not contented himself with indicating what he esteemed weak points, or unfounded assertions, in detail, but he has daringly and insolently attacked my veracity and my character;—a task easily performed by any one who strikes his poniard under cover of the night, or who shelters himself by *anonymity*, from the omnipotent influence of public opinion; which indeed he has cause to dread.

In the Quarterly Medical Review, the critic thus expresses his vituperations:—

"They (the general readers) cannot be expected to decide between *fact* and *fiction*, and Mr. Koecker deals largely in the *one*, if not in the *other*."—"Having made a general charge of ignorance against Mr. Koecker, I am bound to prove it by some ex-

amples."—"These remarks, some may think, will scarcely be deemed valuable enough to atone for Mr. Koecker's blunders, but if severer critics argue in this way, what will they think of his ignorant and presumptuous abuse of such men as Monro, Hunter, Fox and Blake? men who have really dignified the science and art, which such writers as Mr. Koecker only degrade and make ridiculous by their want of observation and consequent errors."—"He (Mr. Koecker) introduces forty-three narratives or STORIES, which he calls CASES."

Although, according to the opinion of some of my friends, more than one of these citations, taken in connexion with the general bearing of the *strictures*, might come under the charge of libel, yet I scorn the idea of having recourse to law for redress; well convinced that "*the press is the proper corrector of the press*;" besides *truth* is the weapon with which I trust to disarm my antagonist.

I have not passed the last fifteen years of my life in obscurity; on the contrary, without any vanity, I may say that I enjoyed the patronage and the confidence of society in the United States of America; and I doubt not, that the selection of credentials, inserted in the appendix, will better repel the charge of ignorance, extravagance, and want of integrity, than any elaborate statements from my own pen. On my arrival in England, I was advised by my friends to publish these, and other numerous documents of a similar nature, but delicacy has hitherto restrained me. Now, however, that my character has been ignominiously and maliciously assailed, I humbly hope that I shall not be blamed in using them in self-defence; the more especially as I am a foreigner, and am anxious to preserve, unsullied, in the old, the reputation I acquired in the new world. Of the respectability and importance of these testimonials, every reader is able to judge, and I do not hesitate to think, that after their perusal, the true motives of the malicious *strictures* will be sufficiently developed.

In addition to these documents, I might refer to several favourable notices of my work, in the *Literary Journals*, but I shall content myself by making some quotations from various Medical Periodicals in which it has been noticed; simply premising that, while most of them have complained, in a greater or less degree, of my too great want of courtesy toward my brother Dentists, they have done me justice in what respects the history, the pathology, and the diseases of the teeth, and the modes of practice which I have long followed, and which I have ventured, with perfect confidence, to recommend to the profession, and to the world.

That some of my strictures were not misplaced, however, appears from the subsequent quotations:—

"Of late years, Dentists have sprung up in every corner, which may account for so many people having bad teeth: at least, we are fully convinced that there is no department of surgery in which injudicious interference so often takes place, or gives rise to more inconvenience or suffering."—"We would recommend to our Dentists, to forgive the unceremonious manner in which their pretensions are treated: the rather, as we believe the censures bestowed upon them, to be in general deserved." See *The London Medical and Physical Journal*, No. 332, pp. 372, 373.

I may here remark, that the credentials contained in the appendix, and the following extracts from the *Medical Periodicals*, place the author of the *strictures* in a rather awkward position, for two reasons; the first of which respects my veracity, the second my professional character. If the reviewer be justifiable in his accusations, all the honourable and respectable individuals who took an interest in my welfare, on my departure from the United States, must have sadly deceived themselves, which, to say the least, is not very probable; and all the English contemporary journalists, who have ascribed any merit to my work, or who have spoken of my professional talents from personal acquaintance or from having witnessed my treatment and operations, must be very deficient in capacity and integrity—a conclusion to which the British public is not likely to accede. But let us now come to the quotations.

"Mr. Koecker's work is composed of two parts, embracing rather a hasty view of the Natural History of the Teeth, of their diseases and treatment, as well as more extended essays on the various operations performed by Dentists. Books of this kind too often abound *with quackery*, of which, however, although some passages might have been omitted, without detriment to the volume, we are happy in being able to acquit Mr. Koecker."

In the same journal, some citations from my book are thus prefaced:—

"The following observations are for the most part judicious:—
"There is much reason in the following:—"
"His plans are generally simple and judicious:—"
"Upon the whole, the work is an useful epitome of the Dentist's art, and of the prophylactic and remedial treatment of the teeth." See *The Lancet*, No. 158, pp. 755—757.

In a very widely circulated journal, the reviewer, amid some criticisms, remarks—

"Mr. Koecker's book comprises much instructive matter."—
"His pathological observations are concise, but valuable."—

“Throughout the article we have essayed to secure approbation for the best parts of the volume, many of which appear to be original.”

After devoting no less than eighteen very closely printed pages to this review—a circumstance that alone shews considerable importance was attached to the book—the reviewer concludes in the following handsome terms :

“We have reason to know that Mr. Koecker *is a very excellent practical Dentist; and that the zeal and ability with which he manages every operation he undertakes, are truly praise-worthy.* These qualifications will, we trust, ensure him patronage and success in this metropolis.” See *The Medico-Chirurgical Journal*, Jan. 1827, pp. 130—132. 213, 214.

In a third periodical, it is said that,

“Mr. Koecker’s volume is one, in which those interested in the art (Dentistry), will derive much information, and shews Mr. K. to be a man of good medical education, as well as of considerable research.” See *The Lond. Med. and Phys. Journal*, No. 332, p. 373.

The subsequent citations are truly gratifying :

“The volume by Mr. Koecker, though directed principally to the teeth, proves the great advantage of studying a single branch of medical science, after having acquired a knowledge of the general principles of the whole; and if not without faults, which we may point out, *is certainly a better work, and more generally instructive, than any other we are acquainted with.* He has discussed more particularly the relations of the teeth with the other organs of the body, and the consequent necessity of having a reference to the state of the Dental operations in many different maladies.”

After quoting my observations on the local causes of diseases of the teeth, it is remarked by the same writer that,

“These observations are truly valuable, and will, we trust, have much weight in preventing many of those operations which, though sanctioned by so great a man as that of Hunter, must, in the present day, have appeared, to a reflecting mind, exceedingly irrational.”—“The directions of the author on this head (the time and circumstances best adopted for operations on the teeth), are so judicious, that we quote them at length.”—“The chapter on the *preservative treatment* of the teeth and gums, is deserving of great attention, inasmuch as *prevention of disease*, at all times preferable to cure, is especially valuable in the affections of organs, which, like the teeth, possess very small powers of reparation.” One of the most interesting and important parts of the volume is that, which has for its subject, “*The treatment of the teeth and gums of children at the time of Second Dentition,*” as upon the proper practice, at this period, *much of the health of the mouth in after life depends.*—“What we have said is sufficiently indicative of our opinion, respecting the author’s ability. We certainly

believe he understands his art, and his book contains much valuable matter." See *The Lond. Med. Repos. and Review*, No. 154, pp. 323—329.

To these observations are appended some criticisms and kind suggestions, of which the author will not fail to take advantage in due time.

I shall next bring forward some favourable evidence from the very Review to which the *strictures*, as already said, form a kind of appendage.

"Whatever professed Dentists may think of Mr. Koecker's work, and of the freedom with which he exposes the mischief which he unequivocally imputes to the majority of their principles and operations, we are quite persuaded that it must prove essentially useful to the medical profession, and to the public in general."—"We beg leave once more to recommend the work to the medical profession, as one well deserving attention; and from the perusal of which, intelligent practitioners cannot fail to derive hints which may be highly beneficial in general practice."

It is quite evident besides, that the editor of the *Quarterly Medical Review*, did not agree with the penman of the "*additional strictures*," for he expressly says,

"Notwithstanding the difference of opinion expressed by the writer of these observations, *from that which we hold with regard to the general merits of the volume under review*, we think it but fair to give to Mr. Koecker's professional brethren, an opportunity of replying to the accusations he has so freely levelled against them." See *The Quarterly Med. Review*, pp. 40, 41, 49.

The critic himself most mercifully acknowledges that my work contains "*a quantity of useful matter*," though he is of opinion that, "*all that is either new or important*," might have been much condensed, and that I, "*now and then deviate into a sensible hint*" and a "*shrewd observation*:" consequently he avows that the work possesses *some merit*.

Again, he assumes a charitable vein, and adds—

"I am happy to say that I have discovered, even in the volume of such a writer as Mr. Koecker, *some judicious remarks, and new observations*;" and he also talks of "*the value of the remark*;" and adds, "*The following observation, from its importance to the public, cannot be too often reiterated*:"—"I have great pleasure too, in extracting the following passage, which, in my opinion, is grounded on sound observation." See *The Quarterly Med. Review*, No. 1, pp. 49, 55, 56.

The Dentist-Critic, after proclaiming his merciful condescension in passing over, in silence, "*the author's conceit, egotism, and bad english*," tells us that he prefers "*presenting merely a plain statement of the contents of the book*," and then he proceeds to make his charges against me.

“I have acknowledged,” says he, “that Mr. Koecker’s work possesses *some* merit; but I must also say, that whatever is valuable in it, is combined with such an alloy of ignorance—ignorance not only of the present practice of Dental surgery, but also of the very first principles of anatomy. That it can only be of *any* use *whatever* to Dentists who have learnt, from experience, to distinguish between Mr. Koecker’s gratuitous assertions, and the actual operations of nature. To general readers (though Mr. Koecker professes his book to be intended for their use), *we* do not hesitate to say, that the work is not only useless, but dangerous. *They* cannot be expected to decide between *fact* and *fiction*; and Mr. Koecker deals largely in the one, if not in the other.”

“Having made a general charge of *ignorance* against Mr. Koecker, *I* am bound to prove it by some examples.”

“Mr. Koecker states at p. 38, ‘that at the age of six and seven, the mouth of the child, which has not lost any teeth, contains twenty, the whole temporary set, and twenty-eight of the permanent.’ It is notorious to every one, who has ever looked into a human mouth, that the “permanent” set consists, not of twenty-eight, but thirty-two teeth; AND THAT EVEN THE JAW OF THE FŒTUS CONTAINS THE WHOLE OF THESE. If Mr. Koecker wants any confirmation of this, let him look into M. Serres’ excellent treatise “Anatomie et Physiologie des Dents.” That accurate observer says, “*A trois mois j’ai constaté la présence non seulement des GERMES de la première, mais même ceux de la seconde dentition jusqu’ a la dente dite de Sagesse.*”

I might answer the above futile criticism, by stating, simply, that the writer has, either *carelessly* or *wilfully*, passed over an essential distinction; I speak of the TEETH: whereas Mr. Serres alludes in the above French quotation, to the GERMS OF THE TEETH.

As I am one of the number who think that the rudiments of the whole animal machine, exist in the embryo, though not evident to our senses; so I can readily agree to the doctrine of Mr. Serres, that the GERMS of all the teeth, both of the first and second dentition, are to be found in the jaws of the FŒTUS: but I cannot but dissent *in toto* from our reviewer, when he authoritatively, but absurdly, maintains against the knowledge of every Anatomist and Dentist, *that the whole of the thirty-two permanent teeth are contained in the jaw of the fœtus.* In his extreme ardour to find fault, the acute and sapient reviewer has completely betrayed himself, and demonstrated to the world his own consummate folly. I suppose he has been misled by grossly misinterpreting a statement made by Serres, in the work above referred to, where this ingenious author says, *that “in a child of four, five, or six years of age”*—NOT IN THE FŒTUS—“fifty-two teeth are to be found, twenty-six in

each jaw, of which ten are visible, and sixteen not yet protruded." Vide *Essai sur l'Anatomie et la Physiologie des Dents*, par A Serres, pp. 5. 197.

The only difference of consequence then, between Mr. Serres and me, is, that he asserts the presence of the four wisdom teeth at an earlier age than my experience warrants: and I cannot, without further investigation, yield this point to Mr. Serres; the more especially as my statement is in coincidence with Hunter's and Fox's opinions.

After having stated, *that at the time of birth*, the bodies of twenty *temporary* teeth are found in the two jaws, Fox adds,

"Besides these twenty teeth, there are, in a very early stage of their formation, the rudiments of some other teeth, which are to form part of the *permanent*, or adult set."

Again:—

"At about six years of age, those teeth, designed to succeed the temporary ones, and the first and second *molars*, are in considerable forwardness; and if none of the temporary ones have yet been renewed, there are at this time in the head, forty-eight teeth, twenty *in situ*; and within the jaws, beneath the gums, in the progress of formation, twenty-eight."

"In the eight or ninth year, the formation of the third *molars*, or *dentes sapientiæ*, begins." See Fox's *Nat. Hist. &c. of the Teeth*, Part I. pp. 4. 17. See also Hunter's *Works*.

Having thus retorted successfully the first charge of ignorance upon the critic, I shall proceed to his second.

"Mr. Koecker adds, 'from the rudiments of the temporary teeth, those of the permanent are formed;' this is, evidently, nonsense."

I shall only say, that the authorities for my assertion, are Blake and Fox; to the work of the latter I refer the reader. Part I. p. 26.

I have said that the *enamel forms a perfectly insensible covering*; a remark which has called forth the following exclamation from the critic:—

"I should like to know, if that be the case, how any indication of touch can be communicated to the teeth?"

I have also stated, that the enamel, from its not being organized, is not subject to the immediate influence of inflammation; upon which the reviewer adds this edifying comment.

"My own opinion is, decidedly, the reverse of his (Mr. Koecker's), for it is quite impossible to account for many of the natural phenomena, without allowing the organization of the enamel."

I might here get rid of these remarks, by the legitimate

answer : that neither presumptive evidence, nor analogical inference, is equivalent to *demonstration*.

I answer the reviewer's question by saying, that the enamel acts as a conductor of sensation to the nerves of the teeth ; but I retain my opinion, which is fortunately, in accordance with the ideas of most anatomists and pathologists of the present day, as well as with those of Hunter and Fox. The former author, indeed, considered the whole tooth to be unorganized ; and the latter, who does not admit this doctrine, denies the organization of the enamel. Vide Nat. Hist. of the Teeth, Part. I. p. 26. De. Blainville was of the same way of thinking, for he speaks of "*la partie excrétée ou morte,*" in reference to the whole crown of the tooth. Vide Nouveau Histoire Naturelle applique aux Arts.

A few remarks upon the teeth, *as a whole*, may be of higher importance. The great Hunter had the most extraordinary ideas respecting them.

"Nature," says he, "seems, in some measure, to have considered the teeth as *aliens*, only giving them nourishment while sound and fit for service." See His Nat. Hist. of the Teeth, Part I. p. 12.

And yet the same author tells us that :—

"The teeth would seem to be very sensible ; for they appear to be subject to great pain, and are easily and quickly affected, either by heat or cold." See His Work on the Teeth, Part II. p. 14.

Mr. Fox says :—

"It is very extraordinary that Mr. Hunter should have considered the teeth as devoid of internal circulation. The structure of the teeth is similar to that of any other bone, and differs only in having a covering, which is called enamel, for the exposed surface, and in the bony part being more dense."—"It is scarcely to be credited that Mr. Hunter, after saying that the teeth are to be considered as *extraneous bodies*, with respect to a circulation through their substance, should immediately afterwards have added that 'they, the teeth, have most certainly a living principle, by which means they make part of the body, and are capable of uniting with any part of a living body.' See Fox on the Teeth, Part I. p. 3, 4, and Part II. Introduction, pp. 2, 3.

I have given it as my opinion, that the teeth are organized, vascular, and interwoven with nervous and arterial fibres ; a remark which has called forth this animadversion :

"We do not dispute the accuracy of this doctrine ; but we can admit it only as a matter of analogical inference. Every thing that grows must have life and be organized ; consequently the teeth are vital, and composed of organic structure : if they were protected

from the external air, and the influences of chemical and mechanical agents, and, when diseased, were cleaned and dressed, as bones are, it might be *inferred*, that they would regenerate their structure as other organs do. Mr. K. has *said*, but not shewn, that the teeth are *vascular*." See The Medico-Chirur. Rev. No. 11, p. 131.

Serres assures the world that :—

"The teeth are not inorganic bodies, deprived of vessels and nerves, as Hunter maintained. Bichat has so well refuted this error in his "*Anatomic Generale*," that it requires no further notice." Vide Essai Sur. L'Anatomie et la Physiologie, Des Dents, p. 26.

A periodical writer says :—

"Much dispute has taken place as to the vitality of the teeth; and it has been justly observed, that Mr. John Hunter's opinions upon this subject were very vague. He considered them 'as extraneous bodies, with respect to a circulation through their substance;' although the experiments upon which he relied, appear to us, as they have done to others, to refute his own assertions: for he found that *growing teeth* do become tinged with madder;—and, hence, therefore, in one period of their existence, there must be vitality. Dr. Blake also found, that the colouring matter is subsequently absorbed; which, with us, decides the question:—but taking Hunter's experiments alone, the fair deduction is, not that when growth is perfected all circulation ceases; but that it is diminished, because we see the very same process, but in a less degree, take place in common bone."—"Every circumstance proves to us, that we must regard the tooth as a living part."—"We have introduced this discussion, because we know that it is really a widely spread opinion among the profession, that the teeth are dead parts, and may be treated accordingly." Lond. Med. Repos. and Review, No. 151. p. 317.

I trust I have again maintained my ground, and that is all I desire.

The next objection of the critic, is the appellation "lining membrane of the tooth," which I have used for the soft parts contained in the cavity of the tooth. To this paltry remark, it is enough to state, that Fox calls the same part '*the membrane lining the cavity of the tooth*;' and the above is merely a more concise method of expressing the same idea. See his Work on the Teeth, Part I. p. 36.

I am next charged with making statements, not only contradictory to each other, but contrary to truth, viz.: that I have, in one part, asserted, that the poorer classes of society frequently preserve their teeth longer than their wealthy and refined neighbours; and in another, that the lower classes are particularly subject to absorption of the gums and sockets of the teeth. Can any individual, besides

the reviewer, make out contradiction in these statements? In the first case I allude to diseases of the teeth *generally*; in the second, to a particular specified disease.

I have stated that, caries of the teeth and the devastation or absorption of the gums and alveolar processes, have hitherto been misrepresented, or altogether considered as incurable; an assertion which I am still inclined to maintain:—I mean that in many cases, caries has been misrepresented, or considered altogether incurable; and that the disease of the gums, &c. in question, had been always reckoned incurable.

My first position is consonant with the ideas of Fox, who alludes to it oftener than once.

In his Work Part II, p. 36, he says, “In some instances the decay proceeds so rapidly, *that it cannot be checked by any means.*”

I have added that “caries may be considered an affection of a contagious nature.” This is the only error of which the critic justly accuses me: the word I should have employed, was *infectious*, and not *contagious*; in which I am sanctioned by the high authority of Hunter and Fox. See Hunter on the Teeth, Part II. p. 10.

The last named writer says,

“It may be asserted as a general rule, that caries in one tooth will produce disease in that which is contiguous.”

“When the caries is occasioned by contact, it probably arises from the action of some acrimonious discharge from the decaying tooth; which, in the first place, occasions a decomposition of the enamel, and afterwards the destruction of the tooth.” See Fox on the Teeth, Part II. p. 20.

I have asserted that, “Tartar is one of the most frequent causes of diseases of the teeth; it acts directly chemically in the destruction of them, it being one of the most powerful causes of diseases of the gums.” Upon this statement our critic, in page 52, observes:—

“The fact, which has been proved, *beyond a doubt*, is that, tartar is a substance, created by small glands, which are situated in the gums, and are the same which serve to lubricate the cartilaginous substance of the infant’s gums. After the teeth are grown, the glands in question, are employed in secreting the matter called tartar. Tartar is never the original cause of disease; but the increased accumulation of it, from an unhealthy or neglected state of the mouth, is the consequence of local or constitutional disorder. There is no doubt, that from the mechanical irritation which it exercises in the soft parts, when allowed to gather, and the offensive effect on the breath, it is very desirable to clear the teeth of it, and to prevent its accumulation: but it is certain, that so far from its (tartar) acting chemically in the destruction of the teeth; the

latter, when completely encrusted with it, seems to be preserved thereby from decay."

It remained for my reviewer to make the splendid discovery in the nineteenth century that, *tartar is a preservative of the teeth*. He has fairly outstriped his master, who puts the following question:—

"Son action immédiate est-elle, à cause de sa nature grasse, de garantir les dents, de l'action physique ou chimique des corps extérieurs, de leur communiquer une sorte de flexibilité?"

Our candid reviewer ought assuredly to have acknowledged, that he extracted the greater part of the above account of the *tartar*, from his favourite author Serres, who boasts of having discovered these "*Glandes Dentaires et leur Usage*."

Mr. Serres further informs us, that "the tartar of the teeth has much employed the sagacity of Dentists, who occupied themselves respecting the means of dissolving it, of preventing its formation, &c., without having sought after its source. It is evident that it is not a deposit from the saliva, as they have advanced; for on evaporation of this fluid to dryness, no similar residuum is found. It is the production of a secretion from these glands: this product changes with the period of life:—white in children, it communicates to the teeth that polish which renders them brilliant to the age of twenty or twenty-five years; duller and yellowish in the adult."

To me, it seems surprising, that Mr. Serres should ever have imagined, that the tartar of the teeth is the secretion of a peculiar set of glands, of which he has given a representation. Is it not allowed by all authors, that tartar is *an extraneous matter—a foreign deposition*—whatever may be its source? Is it not the result of want of due cleansing of the teeth in some cases; and in others, its accumulation a consequence of diseased action? If Mr. Serres' doctrine be admitted, it follows that nature has provided peculiar glands in all men, to perform a *natural function* during infancy, and a *diseased one* during the remainder of life; a sentiment that is quite preposterous.

I have no doubt that the tartar is deposited from the saliva, which secretion is more or less changed in its qualities, by the influence of diseases, especially those of the *primæ viæ*: and, although, on chemical analysis, healthy saliva does not yield tartar, yet morbid saliva might afford such a product. Besides, the quantity of tartar in the saliva, must, in general, be so minute as to avoid detection; since it often requires many years for a trifling deposition.

As many, I may say most, individuals, who even enjoy steady good health, have the roots and necks of their-teeth thinly coated with tartar ; its accumulation appears in them to be unconnected with disease, and to be a mere deposit.

Hunter says in his *Work on the Teeth*, Part II. p 26.

“All our juices contain a considerable quantity of calcareous earth, which is dissolved in them, and which is separated from them upon exposure, which continues mixed with the mucus ; so that the extraneous matter consists of earth and the common secreted mucus.”

And in a note in the first part of his work, the same celebrated author compares the tartar of the teeth to “a crystallization of the same nature,” as that which takes place around the nucleus of intestinal concretions, or bezzars.

Fox states that,—

“This (the tartar) is an earthly substance, held in solution by the saliva, and is deposited upon the teeth, as the saliva undergoes decomposition.” See his *Work on the Teeth*, Part II. p. 101.

Mr. J. Hare, several years ago, stated,

“That tartar is a condensation of vitiated mucus and extraneous matter, which a disordered stomach occasions upon the surface of the tongue, where, by reason of its viscosity, the saliva has not the power sufficiently to dilute it; and that by inattention to the constant cleansing of the tongue, it actually acquires a degree of putrefaction, which accounts for the dark colour of tartar that has long been allowed to accrete.” Vide “View of the Structure, Functions, and Disorders of the Stomach, &c.”

Such were the reasons I had urged against Mr. Serres’ doctrine, that the tartar of the teeth was a secretion, before the last number of the *Edinburgh Medical and Surgical Journal* fell into my hands. The reader may suppose then how delighted I was on finding in No. 90, p. 26. that Dr. P. S. Denis has published, in a late number of the *Journal de Chemie Medicale*, some important observations on the relation between the tartar of the teeth, and the saburral crust of the tongue. On analysing a quality of the white crust, which forms on the tongue during dyspepsia, it was found to consist of

Altered Mucus	50
Phosphate of Lime	34.66
Carbonate of Lime	8.66
Ordinary Soluble Salts of the animal Fluids	} 6.68
	100

This statement agrees very exactly with the analysis of

the tartar of the teeth, as determined by M. M. Vauquelin and Langier.

M. Denis is of opinion that the tartar of the teeth is neither a deposition from the saliva, nor a secretion from the gums; but that it owes its formation to the saburral secretion from the tongue enveloping the teeth and depositing its crystalline matter upon them. The justice of this conclusion he endeavours to establish by various arguments, and especially by his having found that the slimy matter which envelopes the teeth of dyspeptics, who neglect to clean them, has the same composition as the saburral matter of the tongue.

It may be here remarked that my opinion, which is that of my predecessors, is also corroborated by M. Denis's observations; since it will not be denied that the *slimy matter*, of which he speaks, is chiefly formed by *saliva*.

Having endeavoured to refute the assertion of Mr. Serres and of our anonymous critic, with respect to the *tartar of the teeth being a secretion*, I shall next add a few quotations in support of my opinion as to its *morbid effects*, and against my opponent's idea, that it is a *preservative of the teeth*.

Agreeably to Hunter,

"When it (tartar) has so much increased as to touch the gums, it produces ulceration of that part, and a train of bad consequences: often the gums receding from this matter, become very tender and subject to hemorrhage."

"The alveolar processes frequently take part with the gums, and ulcerate, so that the teeth are left without their support, and at last drop out."

Again says this author,

"I have seen it (the tartar) cover, not only the whole tooth, but a great part of the gums: in this case there is always an accumulation of a very putrid matter; frequently considerable tenderness and ulceration of the gums, and scalding becomes absolutely necessary." See Hunter on Dis. of the Teeth, pp. 55. 124.

Fox maintained similar opinions,

"When," says he, "the teeth are not regularly cleaned from the tartar, which constantly gathers about them, and also particles of food which may lodge between them, a putrefactive fermentation takes place, which, not to speak of the offensive fetor it produces, always injures the gums, and disposes the teeth to fall into a state of decay."—"Excepting the disease of caries, nothing is so destructive of the healthy condition of the mouth, or of the duration of the teeth, as the accumulation of tartar." See Fox on the Teeth, Part II. pp. 21. 101.

I shall conclude this subject by another citation :—

“Of local causes of diseases of the teeth, the accumulation of tartar, is both the most frequent and the most destructive.”—
 “M. Piorry has lately made some observations upon the effects of *carious teeth* upon the neighbouring parts; but, the truth is, *that the mere accumulation of tartar without caries*, will be productive of many of the same evils.” See *The London Medical Repository and Review*, No. 154. p. 321.

I have alluded to the morbid influence and to the chemical effects, of improper artificial teeth; the second of which, the critic does not admit; assigning, as his reason, that no morbid chemical action can take place in consequence of the operation of the juices of the mouth upon gold or platinum. Hence we might infer, that this practical Dentist made his artificial teeth entirely of gold or platinum. Now even admitting that they were wholly formed of these two metals,—which is impossible,—though they would not be effected by morbid chemical action; yet, owing to their great specific gravity, their mechanical effects would be rapidly injurious.

I have said that,

“The Dentist, by judicious management, might prevent all bad consequences, even although the use of mercury or other medicines of the like nature, should be the treatment adopted.”—‘Dentists,’ says the critic, ‘are in general too modest to engage to prevent all bad consequences in cases of this kind; but, if Mr. Koecker has any specific of the kind he insinuates, if he has found some *quid rectius*, I think him extremely culpable in withholding his discovery from the profession of the present day.’

To this I reply, that I know of no other *quid rectius* than the proper aids of Dental Surgery, used with skill and comprehensive judgment.

The critic next derides me for holding in great estimation, the proper and judicious application of tooth-powder and tooth-brushes; observing that, “this savours strongly of charlatanism.” But I shall not be readily moved, either by his ridicule, or by his erroneous conclusions. Experience has proved to me the true value and the high importance of my practice, and I can appeal to my patients, all of whom, I am convinced, will be ready to support my doctrine.

In order to defeat a novel principle, to which I have attached much practical importance; viz. that the first large grinders being more frequently affected by, or predisposed to, disease than the other teeth, their early removal is calculated to prevent, and to remove, irregularity,

and to preserve the health of the remaining teeth. My opponent again refers to Mr. Serres, whose words are :

"J'observerai comme je l'ai déjà dit, que tous les grands efforts portent sur les grosses molaires at notamment sur la première ; or, cette dent est la plus large, la plus épaisse, celle dont les racines sont les plus fortes."

Now it must be evident to every reader, possessed of ordinary judgment, that Mr. Serres' assertions, so far from being in opposition to the above principle, in some measure advocate it ; for, it is but reasonable to suppose, that if there is a great bearing on the teeth in question, it might be one of the causes of their greater pre-disposition to disease at an early period. My principle has been recognized, with approbation, by an able anonymous writer, as well as by many medical practitioners, and its benefits made evident to numerous patients. The reviewer alluded to says,

"The *incisors* and the *cuspidati* are so essential to all the purposes to which the teeth serve, that nothing but extensive and irremediable disease will justify their removal. Neither, in Mr. Koecker's opinion, ought less regard to be had to the *bicuspidati* ; and, in this there can, among reflecting minds, be no difference of opinion." See The Lond. Med. Repos. and Review, p. 327.

Among local causes of caries, I have maintained,

"Diseases of the gums, the alveoli, periosteum and maxillary bones, as also dead roots, and teeth ; tartar ; judiciously performed operation ; bad artificial teeth, &c." And my adversary remarks that, "to expose this absurd hypothesis, would draw out this critique to an unaccountable length. It is, perhaps, sufficient to say, that all persons acquainted with the subject properly consider many of them not as *causes* of caries, but as *consequences* of it."

These remarks, while they show the malicious intentions of the critic, at the same time display his ignorance of pathology, in not being aware of the simple fact, that as no cause can exist without producing some effect, so every effect must evidently become the cause of another effect :—hence, the bad consequences of caries, as well as caries itself, in one tooth, may unquestionably become a cause of caries in another.

The next charge is politely conveyed in these words :

"Mr. Koecker's total ignorance of the practice of London is quite manifest." "The instruments," says he, "generally used, are the punch, the pelican, and the key, and some pairs of forceps, &c. And again, "the forceps in common use at present, are so ill contrived, &c." To this the critic replies, "how very cunningly and inconsistently with truth he gives the above list of the apparatus of

his bretheren, in thus circumscribing it to the punch, pelican, key, and a few pairs of forceps."—"The truth, however, is, that the *punch*, is quite superceded by the lever, the *pelican* is not known only to a few as a kind of curiosity; the *key* improved, at least in the way in which I use it, acts both as *key* and *forceps*. As to *forceps* I can decidedly speak in regard to my own practice, and those I am acquainted with, that they form the principal instruments of extraction, and are now made on the best mechanical principles, and adapted, individually, for every situation and state of the teeth."

I reply that neither the above quotations from my volume, nor any other parts of it, refer to the instruments used in London, exclusively, or in any other particular place or country. My statement is, in every instance, *general*; it alludes to the practice of the civilized nations of Europe and America. Besides it cannot be unknown to the critic, if he really has been in France, and is not totally ignorant of the literature of that country, that the instruments above referred to are very frequently used there, and are more or less noticed by the greater part of the modern French authors on Dental Surgery, as *M. Gariot, Traité des Maladies de la Bouche; M. Laforque Theor. et Prat. de l'art du Dentist*; and many others.

I am, however, willing to confess my entire ignorance of the critic's dental practice, for which I certainly deserve his censure, considering his great importance, and the high rank he holds in his own opinion.

The reviewer is struck at the "enormous number of instruments," which I employ for the complete performance of some few nice operations;—and he adds;

"Whether Mr. Koecker has bestowed the necessary attention on the manipulation of these (alluding to some instruments), I have no means of judging, as in every thing practical, or that might prove useful, he has studied a most profound silence."

The glaring injustice of this accusation, must be evident to every professional reader of the "*Principles of Dental Surgery*;" for, although I have not given any engravings of my apparatus, I trust I have, in every instance, where it was possible, sufficiently explained the principles necessary for its application. As a proof of my sincere endeavour to extend the knowledge of my improvements, I may add, that not a few Surgeons of the highest respectability, in this country, as well as in the United States of America, are in possession of a great part of my peculiar instruments. Besides, the whole of my apparatus has been, and still is, open to the inspection of Surgeon-Dentists, and of the medical profession.

The strictures are thus continued :

"He (Mr. Koecker) leaves us, however, in no doubt as to his having carried improvements in that department, to a most miraculous extent; and informs us, that he has now possessed himself of instruments of extraction, to the *most enormous* amount of eighty; instruments for stopping, one hundred and seventy; and if we assume the same number for scaling and other operations, one hundred and seventy; we shall have the very wonderful number of four hundred and twenty instruments. And the author even adds that, 'he has always a great number at hand, ready to be adapted to peculiar caries.'

I contend that this is not legitimate reasoning. Is it not extraordinary that the writer should draw a conclusion so ridiculous, and so devoid of all *dental* judgment, that if eighty instruments are necessary for extracting, and one hundred and seventy for stopping teeth; consequently one hundred and seventy more must be required for scaling them and for other minor operations? Does not every one know, that for these last operations, much fewer instruments are wanted?

The critic finishes his paragraph with the following remarks :

"The profession might probably have been able to glean something from his (Mr. Koecker's) magazine of curiosities, if he had favoured us with the least glimmering of light, on the principles upon which any one of them was constructed; but he acknowledges he is lost in the vastness of the undertaking, and prevented by the human reflection expressed at page 345, that his apparatus, in consequence of its extent, and on account of its great difference from what is generally used, would not only be dangerous in the hands of the ignorant, but its application would require some previous practical instruction, even on the part of the scientific Dentist."

Although I entertain the hope, that my manual may prove of some use to professional gentlemen, who are more impartial judges than the critic; still he may say, that I was lost in the vast undertaking of endeavouring to instil the least useful light into the minds of those of an equal capacity with his own; knowing too well, that in such hands my instruments might become dangerous weapons, and place in jeopardy the health and happiness of our fellow creatures.

Such are the chief charges which my opponent has brought against me, and such is my defence. But I must give another illustration of excessive unfairness. In my volume I have treated at some length :

"1st. Of the natural history of the teeth and their relative parts: that is, of the gradual formation, and various structures and

functions, at different periods of life, of the teeth, the gums, the sockets, the periosteum, and the jaw bones in their healthy state.

2nd. Of the different diseases to which the teeth and their relative parts are subjected, their symptoms, together with their remote as well as proximate causes, at the different periods and stages of their formation and structure.

3rd. Of the connexions, sympathies, and influences of the teeth, the gums, the sockets, the periosteum, and the maxillary bones, generally and individually, one upon another in their sound and morbid state; and particularly those of the first set upon the permanent teeth.

4th. Of the influences and effects of those parts in their healthy and diseased states, as well as of those of the whole constitution when in health, or when labouring under any general or local disorder upon the teeth, and the other parts immediately connected with them, at different periods of their formation and structure.

5th. Of the various medical and surgical remedies which the art affords; their judicious exhibition, and the opposite effects produced, as well immediately as permanently, by the application of skilful, or improper treatment.

6th. Of the surgical apparatus and mechanical means for the proper application of the above remedies and operations in Dental Surgery, added to a general scientific knowledge of mechanism, and the various collateral mechanical arts intimately connected with its practice." See Principles of Dental Surgery, pp. 34, 35.

In the more practical part of the work, I have treated

Of caries of the teeth, and all its varieties, and of the dental treatment of its different stages, &c.

Of the morbid influences of dead teeth and roots upon the living teeth, the sockets, the maxillary bones and the system generally. The removal of which, I have strenuously recommended, in which I am heartily joined by the reviewer.

Of the devastation or absorption of the gums and sockets of the teeth, and the surgical treatment.

Of the extraction of teeth and roots; under which head, I have indicated the defects of the present modes of executing those operations, and made known my practice of the treatment to be observed after the extraction of teeth, and of the accidents incident to the operation.

Of the operation of stopping carious teeth; and especially of the plans which I pursue.

Of the surgical treatment of the nerves of the teeth when exposed, before stopping their cavities with gold.

This analysis of my work, while it shews the variety and the importance of the subjects embraced; also demonstrates that a determination to find fault must have existed in the mind of the reviewer; since he has only touched upon

a few of its trifling contents, and dared not to assail me upon points of paramount value to professional gentleman and to their patients.

I cannot take notice of some trifling criticisms further than to say—that “the literary gentleman who,” according to the reviewer’s conclusion, “must have had thirty-five teeth,” in reality, like other people, possessed only thirty-two, some of which however had two or three roots, and I have spoken in my enumeration, of “teeth and roots of teeth:—that I have not falsified the assertion of Mr. Fox, although I have said that such cases as he has described, have not occurred in my practice:—that the case, on which ridicule is thrown, of a young lady who submitted “to in all sixty-two operations,” required more operative treatment than ever I, or perhaps any other Dentist, had occasion to employ:—that the doubt, respecting another of my cases, because the lady is somewhat *technical* in her expressions, is totally misplaced, she being the wife of a professional gentleman; and besides her letter may be seen by the *unbeliever*:—and that, with regard to the forty-one other cases contained in my volume, they were selected from hundreds, not as illustrations of *ordinary* cases—for they would then have been useless—but as demonstrations of the originality, peculiarities, and, I would fain hope, the advantages of my practice and of the judicious and comprehensive application of Dental Surgery, in *extraordinary* and extensive diseases of the mouth. The dubious expressions of the critic, probably form the highest encomium on these cases, as they evidently tend to show that he is not in the custom of administering such aids of Dental Surgery to the afflicted individuals who put themselves under his care.

In conclusion, with justice, I may address these words to my opponent, “*Ridicula in imbelli est virtutis ostentatio;*” for he assuredly has over-rated his powers, and gone far “beyond his last.” If he thinks any of my animadversions too severe, I would remind him of the proverb, “*Ab alio expectes, alteri quod feceris,*” and of the motto in the title page of this pamphlet, which may be well rendered by the old adage, “Honesty is the best Policy.”

APPENDIX.

Letter from His Excellency JAMES MONROE, late President of the United States, to RICHARD RUSH, Esq. Ambassador and Minister Plenipotentiary from the United States to Great Britain.

Washington, March 14th, 1822.

To RICHARD RUSH, Minister Plenipotentiary
of the United States, London.

Dear Sir,

The bearer, Dr. Koecker, has been presented to me by respectable authority, as a person skilled in his profession, and a worthy member of society; he is a native of Germany, but has been a resident for many years in the United States, and intending to return to Europe, has requested of me this evidence of the favourable opinion entertained of him here, which I give with the greatest satisfaction, as it affords me an opportunity of assuring you of the great respect and esteem, with which

I am sincerely your's

JAMES MONROE.

Letter from the Honourable JOHN QUINCY ADAMS, formerly Secretary of State to the American Government, now President of the United States.

Washington, May 13th, 1822.

To R. RUSH, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister
Plenipotentiary of the United States, London.

Dear Sir,

I take the liberty of introducing to your acquaintance, Mr. L. Koecker, now of Philadelphia, but who returns to Europe for the restoration of his health, which suffers in our climate.

He has been recommended to me in the warmest terms by several of our most respectable common friends: and if any opportunity should occur in which you may, with convenience, contribute to the furtherance of his views, I beg leave to solicit the favour of your kind offices in his behalf.

I am, with the greatest respect, dear Sir,

Your very humble and obedient Servant,
JOHN QUINCY ADAMS.

A similar letter, from His Excellency the President, was delivered to A. Gallatin, Esq. then Envoy Extraordinary and Minister

Plenipotentiary from the United States at the Court of France, and now holding the same office at the Court of Great Britain.

L. K.

Letter from the Honourable J. C. CALHOUN, Secretary of War of the United States, to RICHARD RUSH, Esq. Ambassador and Minister Plenipotentiary from the United States to Great Britain.

Washington, March 15th, 1822.

To Hon. R. RUSH, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary, London.

Dear Sir,

I take the liberty of introducing to your acquaintance, Dr. Koecker of Philadelphia. The Doctor was originally from Germany, but many years since emigrated to this country, and established himself in his profession in Philadelphia, where, by his skill and gentlemanly conduct, he has acquired the esteem of his acquaintance.

He is about to return to Europe on account of his health, and has solicited a letter to you, which I give him with pleasure.

With great respect and esteem,

I am your obedient Servant,

J. C. CALHOUN.

Extract of a Letter from EDWARD INGERSOLL, Esq. late Editor of the Analectic Magazine and Counsellor at Law.

Philadelphia, July 9th, 1822.

To WASHINGTON IRVING, Esq., London.

Dear Sir,

I take the liberty of addressing you at present, for the purpose of introducing to the pleasure of your acquaintance my friend and neighbour, Mr. Koecker, who is about to revisit Europe in search of health;—a blessing which our capricious climate will not suffer him to enjoy. I beg leave to recommend him to your kindness and attention.

Your's most truly and respectfully,

EDWARD INGERSOLL.

Extract of a Letter from THOMAS SULLY, Esq. the celebrated Historical Painter.

Philadelphia, July 11th, 1822.

To SIR THOMAS LAWRENCE, President of the Royal Academy, London.

My dear Sir,

I am anxious to revive your remembrance of me, for the purpose of making known to you my friend, Dr.

Koecker, a gentleman of the highest standing in his profession as a Dentist: he visits Europe principally for his health.

With sentiments of great esteem,
I have the honour to be,
Your friend and obedient Servant,
THOMAS SULLY.

*Certificate of the Very Rev. DR. STAUGHTON, President of
Columbia College, Washington.*

July 15th, 1822.

The subscriber has the pleasure of stating that Mr. Leonard Koecker, Surgeon-Dentist, is a gentleman who has resided several years in Philadelphia, and who, by the amiableness of his manners, and his very superior skill in his profession, has acquired the esteem and confidence of the most respectable citizens of the place. He visits England with a hope that his health may be benefitted by the voyage. Should the climate better agree with his constitution, than that of Pennsylvania, he will probably resolve on settling in England. Such is the value of his character, and such his professional knowledge, that it would be the happiness of any nation to welcome him to its bosom.

WILLIAM STAUGHTON.

*Letter from T. S. SKINNER, ESQ. Post-Master at Baltimore.
Baltimore, May 8th, 1822.*

To The Right Honourable
SIR JOHN SINCLAIR, Bart.

Dear Sir,

I beg leave to introduce to you, Mr. Koecker, who will hand you this letter; he has resided some years in Philadelphia, and has acquired considerable reputation; he has been considered, by our medical gentlemen at the head of his profession as a Dentist, both in science and skill, and as he may probably settle in London, I request you will favour him with such advice as a stranger may need, under like circumstances.

Very truly and respectfully your's,
I. S. SKINNER.

*Certificate of PHILIP S. PHYSICK, M. D. Professor of Anatomy
in the University of Pennsylvania.*

Philadelphia, July 2nd, 1822.

I do hereby certify, that Mr. Leonard Koecker, has been settled in this city for many years, and has made it his particular business to attend to the diseases of the teeth, and to perform operations on them;—that I have been present at several of these operations, and with much pleasure bear testimony to his skill and dexterity;—that his practice here is very considerable;—that his high reputation for scientific management of the teeth is, in my opi-

nion, fully merited;—and that, in addition to his professional qualifications, he is greatly respected for his probity and worthy conduct.

PHILIP S. PHYSICK.

Letter from GEORGE MC. CLELLAN, M. D., *Professor of Surgery, Jefferson's College, Philadelphia.*

Philadelphia, Walnut Street, July 12th, 1822.

TO L. KOECKER, Esq.

Dear Sir,

I have no friends in Europe to whom I can furnish you with letters of introduction, but I will not lose this opportunity of expressing the causes I have to regret your departure from Philadelphia.

Your amiable urbanity of manners, your unblemished character, and, above all, your accurate knowledge of your profession, have not only gained you a high character as a citizen, but have also elevated the art which you so successfully practise to the rank of a respectable department of surgery. Although the several improvements which you have lately made in the treatment of different diseases of the teeth, all deserve to be noticed, I feel particular inclined to designate your new method of plugging exposed cavities, as I have fortunately experienced its benefits in my own person, and remarked them in the cases of several of my friends. But I will not fatigue you, by enumerating those merits which are already so well appreciated by our citizens. My family regret very much that the preservation of your health should render it necessary for you to leave this country; but we, in common with all who have been your patients, feel persuaded that, if it should prove desirable for you to settle in London, your extraordinary neatness and dexterity in operating, with the superior refinement of your mind and manners, will ensure you every possible success.

With sentiments of great regret,

I am, your's sincerely,

GEORGE MC. CLELLAN.

Letter from DAVID HOSACK, M. D. F. R. S. *Professor of the Theory and Practice of Physic, in the University of New York, &c. &c.*

New York, July 29th, 1822.

TO GEORGE PEARSON, M.D. F.R.S., &c. London.

Dear Sir,

Mr. Koecker, a Dentist of great eminence for his knowledge of the principles of his profession and his practical skill, visits Europe on account of his health, and, should he find England favourable he will probably settle in the metropolis. Should he do so, it will probably be in your power to make him known to your medical friends, and to those who may have occasion for his profess-

ional services. His writings on the teeth will abundantly recommend him to your confidence and consideration. Your attention to him will confer a great favour upon,

Dear Sir, your's very truly,
D. HOSACK.

Letter from JOHN EBERLE, M. D. Professor of the Practice of Physic, Jefferson's College, Philadelphia, and late Editor of the American Medical Recorder.

Philadelphia, July 14th, 1822.

To L. KOECKER, Esq.

My dear Sir,

As you are about leaving this country for Europe, permit me to express my sincere thanks for the many acts of friendship I have received from you, and the great regret I feel, in common with many others in this city, that you have determined to quit us altogether.

No one in this country, or perhaps in any other, has contributed more to elevate the rank of your profession than yourself. As an Operator I am quite certain that you stand pre-eminent amongst us; and the improvements you have introduced into your profession, and published in the Periodical Journals of America, are sufficient testimonials of your talent and ingenuity.

Wherever you locate yourself in Europe, I am persuaded that your great merits will soon acquire you much esteem and patronage. Farewell, may you live long, be prosperous and happy.

With very great respect,

I am your friend and humble Servant,

JOHN EBERLE.

Letter from DR. EBERLE, Philadelphia.

Philadelphia, July 14th, 1822.

To JAMES JOHNSON, M. D. &c. &c., London.

Dear Sir,

This letter will be handed to you by my friend Mr. Koecker, whom I beg leave to recommend to your particular attention, as a gentleman of the most unblemished character, and decidedly the most able and scientific Dentist in this country.

By indefatigable attention to his professional duties, he has suffered considerably in health; to retrieve which, he feels obliged to make a voyage across the atlantic. To me, and a great many others, it is a matter of no small regret, that Mr. K. may not return to this country again, but may locate himself in London, where the sphere of his usefulness is likely to be more extensive.

Mr. Koecker has contributed some very important papers, on the subject of his profession, to the Medical Journals of this

city. His paper on the "Devastation of the Gums," has been re-published in the London Medical Repository; and, you no doubt have seen his interesting observations "On the treatment of denuded nerves of the Teeth," published in one of the late numbers of the Medical Recorder.

Your's, with great respect, &c.
JOHN EBERLE.

Extracts of a Letter from WILLIAM P. DEWEES, M. D. Lecturer on Midwifery, in the University of Pennsylvania.

Philadelphia, July 3rd, 1822.

To JOHN RAMBSBOTHAM, M. D., London.

Dear Sir,

The Gentleman who will present you this letter, is a Dentist of the first standing in this country, and, perhaps is not excelled in any other. To a thorough knowledge of his profession, he adds the amenity and information of the gentleman. Perfect confidence may be reposed in him. We are in the habit *here*, of considering his dictum, in the discharge of his art, as "wisest best;" and I should most sincerely rejoice, could you give him an opportunity to display his uncommon skilfulness upon any patient, or person, who may require it. Dr. Physick, and indeed all our best physicians and surgeons, consider that he possesses unusual dexterity as an operator, joined to a most correct and expanded judgment.

Your's,
W. P. DEWEES.

Letter from S. COLHOUN, M.D., one of the Physicians to the Philadelphia Alms-House; late Physician to the Pennsylvania Hospital; Editor of the American Medical Recorder, &c.

Philadelphia, July 8th, 1822.

To L. KOECKER, ESQ.

Dear Sir,

Having understood that you intend to depart for Europe in a short time, permit me to signify my regret at that circumstance, and to tender you my warmest acknowledgements for the professional services which you have so skilfully and obligingly rendered me. The faithfulness with which you perform your duties in your profession, the improvements which you have made in it, as also your extensive experience among the most respectable part of the community in the United States, will render you a loss to us, not easily to be replaced, and an acquisition to the country you intend to make your future residence. With the best wishes for your health and future success,

I am, respectfully, your friend,
S. COLHOUN.

Extract of a Letter from A. CHAPMAN, M. D., Professor of the Theory and Practice of Physic in the University of Pennsylvania; Editor of the Philadelphia Journal of Medical and Physical Sciences, &c. &c.

To JOHN ABERNETHY, Esq. &c. &c., London.

My dear Sir,

Mr. Koecker, who will hand you this, has for many years, held the highest rank among us, as a most accomplished Dentist. He now visits Europe with the hope that, by a change of climate and other influences, he may recruit his health, which has of late become much impaired.

I have the honor to be, dear Sir,

Very faithfully, your most obedient Servant,

N. CHAPMAN.

Letter from DR. CHAPMAN to ALEXANDER MONRO, M. D., Professor of Anatomy, &c. in the University of Edinburgh.

Philadelphia, July 18th, 1822.

My dear Sir,

Mr. Koecker, the bearer of this, has resided among us for many years, occupying the highest rank as a most scientific and accomplished Dentist. He now visits Europe for the re-establishment of his health, and may probably be attracted, by a liberal curiosity, to your far-famed city. In this event, may I be permitted to ask for him your civilities and attention.

With the greatest respect, I am, dear Sir,

Very faithfully, your Friend, &c.

A. CHAPMAN.

Letter from VALENTINE MOTT, M. D., Professor of Surgery in the University of New York, &c. &c.

New York, July 26th, 1822.

To SIR ASTLEY COOPER, Bart., London.

Honoured Sir,

At the request of the bearer, one of my friends, Mr. Koecker, Dentist, I have ventured to offer a few lines by way of introduction; this I do more cheerfully, as it gratifies my own feelings, and will be doing justice to the most distinguished professional merits.

We regret to lose Mr. Koecker, as his claims are of the first order; but the state of his health makes it necessary that he should visit Europe, where perhaps he may be disposed to remain. He is a gentleman, who will secure the esteem of men of science.

With great respect, &c.

VALENTINE MOTT.

A similar letter, from Dr. Mott, was delivered to Benjamin Travers, Esq. Surgeon.

L. K.

Extract from a Letter from E. W. HORNER, M. D., Adjunct Professor of Anatomy in the University of Pennsylvania.

Philadelphia, July 9th, 1822.

To SIR ASTLEY COOPER, Bart., London.

Dear Sir,

Permit me the honour of introducing to you Mr. Leonard Koecker, an operating and prescribing Dentist of our city, known in the most favorable and eminent manner by the medical profession and the public as large, for his skill and dexterity in that department of the healing art.

Your's &c.

W. E. HORNER.

Letter from JAMES MEASE, M. D. Philadelphia.

Philadelphia, May 22nd, 1822.

To His Excellency RICHARD RUSH, Envoy Extraordinary, and Minister Plenipotentiary, United States, London.

Dear Sir,

Mr. Leonard Koecker, who will have the honour to deliver you this, has resided in this country nearly eleven years, and ten of them in Philadelphia, as a Dentist, and has acquired the personal esteem of every one who has become acquainted with him, on account of his manners as a gentleman, and his great professional skill. He has had the care of my family as a professional man, and has given every member of it the greatest satisfaction. He leaves a profitable practice by reason of his health, which he hopes will be benefitted by a change of climate, and proposes to try the effects of a residence in London. He has my ardent wishes for his restoration to health and his success in life.

Two publications by him, shew his talents as a Dentist, a Physiologist, and an Operator, and cannot fail to leave a very favorable impression upon the mind of every medical man, or brother Dentist, whose prejudices will permit him to judge fairly. He will have difficulties to encounter in London which did not occur in Philadelphia:—but of one thing I am confident, and that is, all that he requires to make him esteemed as a man is, an opportunity to be known; and as a Dentist, cases to shew his skill,

I am, with the greatest respect, your Friend,

JAMES MEASE.

Letters of the same import were furnished to me, by Dr. Mease, for Dr. Bostock; the late Samuel Parkes, Esq., the well known Chemist; and the Rev. J. H. Horne, Surrey Institution.

L. K.

Extracts of a Letter from THOMAS C. JAMES, M. D. Professor of Midwifery in the University of Pennsylvania.

Philadelphia, July 2nd, 1822.

TO SIR EVERARD HOME, London.

Sir,

The immediate object of this intrusion is, at his particular request, to introduce to you a gentleman of scientific acquirements and extensive practice as a Dentist. He visits Europe principally for the purpose of recovering his health, which has been much injured by incessant employment and close application to the duties of his profession.

Mr. Koecker has made himself advantageously known in this country, as well as in Europe, by some ingenious practical papers on the Diseases of the Teeth, as well as by some improvements in the mode of their treatment.

With sentiments of the highest respect,

I remain your much obliged former Pupil, &c.,

T. C. JAMES, M. D.

Extract of a Letter from NATHANIEL POTTER, M.D., Professor of the Theory and Practice of Physic in the University of Maryland.

Baltimore, United States, April 29th, 1822.

TO DR. JOHN ARMSTRONG,

Sir,

The gentleman who will deliver this letter, is an eminent Dentist, who, by a scientific knowledge of his profession, and the sterling integrity of his character, has conciliated the good-will of the professors in the Philadelphia and Baltimore Universities, and of the most discriminating of the medical faculty in general. His ill health induces him to visit your metropolis; how long he may continue there will depend upon contingencies; it is not improbable he may locate himself professionally in London. We have few Dentists who are really learned in their business, so that Mr. Koecker sacrifices all pecuniary considerations in leaving this country. I am inclined to conclude, that he will find few equals, and probably no superiors, in any other. As a stranger in England, he will feel himself honoured by your acquaintance, and be grateful for any advice you may be pleased to give. I beg you to be assured that any attention to my friend will be considered as conferred upon myself, and will, at all times, be warmly reciprocated by me in Baltimore.

Your obedient humble Servant,

NATHANIEL POTTER.

Letter from WILLIAM GIBSON, M. D., Professor of Surgery in the University of Pennsylvania.

Philadelphia, July, 1822.

TO CHARLES BELL, Esq., London.

My dear Sir,

Mr. Koecker, a distinguished Dentist of this place, visits London with a view of establishing himself in his profession. He will be much gratified to have permission to examine your museum, &c. Your good offices will oblige

Your sincere Friend,
W. GIBSON.

Extract of a Letter from JOHN W. FRANCIS, M.D., Professor of Midwifery in the University of New York, &c. &c.

New York, July 29, 1822.

TO THOMAS PETTIGREW, Esq.,
Fellow of many Societies, &c. &c., London.

Dear Sir,

It affords me much gratification to introduce to your kindly attentions the bearer, Mr. Koecker; a gentleman of great private worth, who, for many years, has been eminently distinguished for his writings and skill in a particular branch of science, Dentistry.

Your's, &c.
JOHN W. FRANCIS.

Extract of a Letter from THOMAS SEWALL, M.D., Professor of Anatomy and Physiology, Columbia College, Washington.

Washington City, April 26th, 1822.
United States of America.

TO THOMAS CHEVALIER, Esq.

Dear Sir,

I take the liberty of introducing to you, the bearer, Mr. Koecker, Surgeon-Dentist, of Philadelphia. He visits Europe for the benefit of his health, and in his tour will spend some time in London. Mr. K. has for several years sustained a high reputation as a scientific Dentist, and a man of good character, of which he has many ample testimonials from some of our first physicians. Any attention it may be convenient to you to render him will be very gratefully acknowledged.

With great respect, I am, dear Sir,
Your obedient humble Servant,
THOMAS SEWALL.

Extract of a Letter from JOSEPH DELAPLAINE, Esq. Editor of the Repository of the Portraits and Lives of distinguished American Characters.

TO DR. JAMES MOORE,
Director of the National Vaccine Institution, London.

Philadelphia, August 15th, 1822.

Dear Sir,

I beg leave to introduce to your acquaintance my friend Dr. L. Koecker, as every way deserving your notice. He has resided amongst us for ten years, practising with great skill and success his profession as a Dentist.

I solicit, most earnestly, your friendly attentions to my friend, who, after having married in this city, most respectably and advantageously, and having enjoyed the highest share of professional business, is compelled to abandon prospects, to which none but men of his eminence are entitled.

With very high respect, I have the honour to be,

Your obedient humble Servant,

JOSEPH DELAPLAINE.

Mr. Delaplaine addressed another letter, of the same tenor to that distinguished Chemist, Dr. Henry of Manchester. L. K.

Extract of a Note from SAMUEL BAKER, M. D., Professor of Materia Medica in the University of Maryland.

Baltimore, March 22nd, 1822.

As Dr. Koecker intends visiting Europe, permit me to say that his standing as a citizen, his character as a gentleman, and his professional talents as a Dentist, entitle him to the esteem and confidence of society.

SAMUEL BAKER.

Extract of a Letter from the REV. M. LE WALZ, Director of the Franconian Academy at Philadelphia, and Minister at Frankfort.

Philadelphia, 22me Juin, 1822.

A Son Excellence le BARON DE DRAIS, Conseiller d'Etat et Chef de de la Suprême cour de Justice de son ALTESSE ROYALE LE GRAND DUC DE BADE, Chevalier de l'ordre du Merite, &c. &c. &c. Manheim.

Vôtre Excellence
et très Venerable Oncle.

Voudra bien avoir la grace de recevoir le porteur du present, Monsieur le Dr. L. Koecker, comme un homme

qui par l'éminence de ses talens et de son caractère s'est acquis une réputation générale dans ce pays. Recommandé par le premier Magistrat des Etats Unis et les Ambassadeurs étrangères, j'ose être persuadé que M. Koecker se rendra parfaitement digne de toutes les faveurs dont vous aurez la bonté de l'honorer.

Me recommandant à vous et à tous ceux qui ont le bonheur d'appartenir à votre famille, j'ai l'honneur d'être avec la plus parfaite considération de

Vôtre Excellence,

de mon vénérable Onclé,

le tres humble serviteur et neveu,

L. WALZ.

Extract of a Letter from the same.

A Monsieur, Monsieur F. SCHMIDT, Premier Predicateur de sa
MAJESTÉ LA REINE DE BAVIÈRE. Munic.

Philadelphia, 22me Juin, 1822.

Mon très vénérable Cousin,

Le porteur du présent, Mr. le Docteur Koecker se proposant de faire un tour par l'Europe, m'a temoigné un grand désir d'être introduit auprès de vous et de votre famille. Ayez la bonté de le recevoir avec ces marques de distinction et d'amitié dont ses merites et son aimable caractère le rendent également digne. M. le Docteur vous donnera les informations nécessaires pour ce qui regarde ma situation actuelle en Amerique. Je n'y puis qu'ajouter que le bon Dieu m'a fait trouver le grand sècret d'être content. Je fixe mes regards dans l'éternité qui m'apprend à m'élever sur un monde qui n'est que transitoire.

Vôtre belle destinée vous mettant dans l'état d'approcher chaque jour, sa Majestè LA REINE de Baviere, j'ose vous prier de lui exprimer les sentimens de haute et profonde veneration que je partage avec tous ceux qui ont le bonheur de le connoitre et d'apprécier son rang et ses vertus. En cas que M. Koecker vous fasse voir le désir d'être admis dans l'auguste présence de sa Majesté, je vous prie de vous montrer favorable a ses intentions.

Recevez vous et madame votre epouse, l'assurance du sincere attachement avec lequel je serai jusque à la fin de mes jours.

Mon tres cher et vénérable Cousin,

le votre,

L. WALZ.

Extract of a Letter from the same.

A Son Excellence LE GENERAL DE KIEFFER au Service de sa MAJESTÉ LE ROI DE BAVIÈRE, Chevalier de plusieurs ordres, &c. &c. &c. Munic.

Philadelphia, 24me Juin, 1822.

Mon cher Ami,

D' introduire auprès de toi le meilleur ami que le bon Dieu m'aye donné dans ma nouvelle patrie c'est je le sais le plus grand plaisir que je puisse faire à toi, et en même tems la plus belle occasion de me rappeler dans tes souvenirs.

A l'égard de Monsieur Koecker j'espère que tu voudras bien le considerer comme un homme qui est cher à mon cœur, et digne de l'estime de tous ceux qui aiment à s'interesser pour le talent et l'aimabilité du caractère.

Si les liaisons dans lesquelles tu étois avec LE ROI existent encore sur le même pied qu' auparavant, il ne sera difficile pour toi de trouver une occasion favorable de présenter Monsieur le Docteur à sa MAJESTE en cas que ce soit son desir.

En souhaitant tout ce qui peut fonder ton vrai bonheur, je te dis adieu.

ton ami fidel,

L. WALZ.

Extract of a Letter from the same.

A Monsieur, Monsieur DE VIERORDT Directeur des Finances de son ALTESSE ROYALE LE GRAND DUC DE BADE Chevalier de l'ordre du Merite, &c. &c. &c. Carlsruhe.

Philadelphia, 22nd Juin, 1822.

Monsieur,

Je saisis avec plaisir l'occasion que m'offre le départ de Monsieur le Docteur Koecker, de vous donner de mes nouvelles, et en même tems de recommander a votre amitié Monsieur le Docteur avec lequel j'ai été lié tres intimement depuis les premiers momens de mon arrivee en Amerique. J'ai à peine besoin de vous rémarquer que Monsieur Koecker par ses talens superieurs s'est acquis dans les Etats Unis une haute réputation, qu'il se voit honoré de l'estime et de l'attachement des personnes le plus distingués dans ce pays. Il a entre autres des lettres de recommandation de son Excellence le President et de tous ceux qui sont attachés a sa personne et à sa dignité, comme aussi des Ambassadeurs étrangers, ce qui sans doute sera suffisant d'introduire Monsieur le Docteur dans les meilleurs circles de l'Europe, et particulièrement de trouver en vous Monsieur un ami et protecteur en cas qu'il le jugera convenable de passer par vôtre ville. J'ose être persuadé que Monsieur Koecker saura par ses aimables et

eminentes qualités se rendre cher à vous et à tous ceux qui auront le plaisir de faire sa connoissance. Veuillez lui rendre son séjour en vôte ville aussi agreeable que vos nobles sentimens vous le dicteront et que sa personne le mērite.

M. Le Docteur aura sans doute le desir d' être introduit aupres de son Altesse Royale LE GRAND DUC, lequel je lui ai représenté comme le plus digne des Princes, j'ai meme osé lui donner une lettre pour son Altesse Royale de laquelle j'espere qu'il sera réçue avec cette grace et condescendance qui ont toujours distingués l' Auguste Maison de nos princes. Ayez la bonté Monsieur de préparer son Altesse pour ce que j'ai fait et de la disposer à admettre Monsieur le Docteur en sa présence.

J'ai l' honneur d' être avec la plus parfaite consideration.

Monsieur,

Votre tres humble serviteur,

L. WALZ.

Besides the above Recommendations, other sealed Letters, from the most distinguished Foreigners then residing in Washington and other parts of the United States were received, addressed to Princes, Noblemen, Gentlemen, &c. of the first rank, among which the following may be noticed.

L. K.

A SON ALTESSE ROYALE LE GRAND DUC DE BADE,
&c. &c. &c.

à Carlsruhe.

A SON ALTESSE LA PRINCESSE FREDERIC DE BADE.

à Carlsruhe.

A Son Excellence Monsieur le COMTE-PRINCE-DE LIEVEN
General d' Infanterie et Aide-de-Camp General de sa Majesté
L' Empereur de toutes les Russies, son Ambassadeur extraordi-
naire et plenipotentiaire aupres sa Majesté Britannique, Chevalier
grand Croix, de plusieurs Ordres, &c. &c. &c.

à Londres.

An Sr Excellenz den Herrn GRAFEN VON MUNSTER MEIN-
HOVEL, Konigl. Grossbrit. Hanov. Staats und Cabinets Minister,
Erblandmarchal, Grosskreuz und Ritter mehrerer hohen Orden,
&c. &c. &c.

in London.

A Son Excellence Le COMTE D' ILSKY, Senateur de sa Ma-
jesté L' Empereur de toutes les Russies, Chevalier Grand Croix
de plusieurs Ordres, &c. &c. &c.

à St. Petersburg.

To the Right Honourable, The Earl of CRAWFORD AND LINDSAY, &c. &c. &c. Richmond-Hill.

Richmond.

A Son Excellence Le Baron de GAYLING, Conseiller d'Etat, Premier Marechal de Cour de son Altesse Royale le Grand Duc de Bade, &c. &c. &c.

à Carlsruhe.

A Son Excellence Le General Baron de HOOLZING au Service de Son Altesse Royale le Grand Duc de Bade, Chevalier de plusieurs Ordres, &c. &c. &c.

à Carlsruhe.

A Son Excellence Monsieur de STRUVE Conseiller d'Etat, Ministre Resident de sa Majestè l'Empereur de toutes les Russies, Son Consul General, Chevalier de plusieurs Ordres, &c. &c. &c.

à Hamburg.

A Son Excellence Le GENERAL DE RUTENBERG, Chevalier de plusieurs Ordres, &c. &c. &c.

à Mietau (Courland.)

Al Illmo Sr. Commendr. JOSIO FRANCISCO D' OLIVEIRA, Encarregado dos Negocios Politicos e Commerciaes dos Estâ dos Portuguezes na Corte de

à Londres.

A Monsieur, Monsieur le BARON DE KEYSERLING, Chambellan de sa Majesté L'Empereur de toutes les Russies, &c. &c. &c.

à Mietau.

A Monsieur, Monsieur le GENERAL M. T. DE MAN, Directeur de l'Archive de la Guerre, Chevalier de plusieurs Ordres, &c. &c. &c.

à La Haye.

A Monsieur, Monsieur MAGNUS BARON DE STACKLEBERG, Premier Chambellan de Sa Majesté le Roi de Suède et de Norvege, Chevalier de plusieurs Ordres, &c. &c. &c.

à Stockholm.

An Sr. Hoch und Wohlgeboren Herrn **CARL VON SCHREIBERS**,
K. K. Rath, Ritter verschiedener Orden, Director der vereinigten
K. K. Naturalien Cabinete, Mitglied verschiedner Wissenschaft-
 lichen Gesellschaften, Doctor der Medicin, &c. &c. &c.

in Wien.

An Sr. Hoch-und Wohlgeboreu den Herrn Baron **CARL VON**
LEDERER K. K. Staats und Conferentz Rath, &c. &c. &c.

in Wien.

An Sr. Hochwohlgeboren, Den Herrn, **Dr. C. W. HUFELAND**,
 Konigl. Preus. Staatsrath, wirklicher Leibarzt, Ritter des rothen
 Adler-Ordens, Director der Med. Chir. Academie, Professor
 an der Universitat zu Berlin, Oberarzt an der Charité, Mitglied
 der Academie der Wissenschaften, &c. &c. &c.

in Berlin.